

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending. By this response, claims 1, 6 and 9 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuasa et al. (US 4,679,077). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Yuasa do not read upon the inventive concept of the present application. The differences between the Yuasa and the present invention were discussed in an interview conducted on March 20, 2007. The Examiner agreed there was a difference between Yuasa's teachings and the present invention and requested clarification of the claim language to distinguish the claims from Yuasa's teachings. Applicants amended the claims to clarify this distinction, however, the Examiner has applied the same reference under a new rejection in view of under 35 U.S.C. §103 instead of §102. Applicants submit that the Examiner's interpretation of the claim language is overly broad and not consistent with the Applicants own disclosure and comments. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended the independent claims again to further define the distinctive features in order to advance prosecution.

If the Examiner believes there is a remaining issue with regard to the Yuasa reference and the claim language, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants representative in order to discuss these issues.

### Monitoring Modules

Independent claims 1 and 6 each recite, *inter alia*, a plurality of separate monitoring modules. Claim 9 refers to the specifics of a monitoring module. Within each separate monitoring module, the steps of recording an image, extracting an area in the recorded image different from a reference image, extracting an object from the area and classifying the object if the object is a human alarm object are all performed. Thus, the monitoring modules themselves in isolation independent of other devices perform these features.

This is not the case in Yuasa. The Examiner refers to the video cameras 1<sub>1</sub>-1<sub>N</sub> as the claimed plurality of monitoring modules and therefore each video camera represents a monitoring module. The video camera in Yuasa separately by itself only performs the obtaining of video signals. Each video camera is connected to the same camera selector switch 2 and processing devices. See Col. 3, line 63 – Col. 4, line 22.

The cameras themselves at best only teach reading of images. The cameras do not perform extracting areas in the recorded image, extracting an object from an area and classifying an object if the object is a human alarm object. In Yuasa, extracting of data and classifying data is performed by the primary and secondary change detector. Thus, the separate video cameras of Yuasa do not perform each of the claimed steps. Each of the cameras in Yuasa rely upon the same primary and secondary change detectors and thus each camera separately does not perform these steps of the claimed invention.

Thus, Yuasa fails to teach the monitoring modules as claimed by Applicants in independent claims 1, 6 and 9.

### Transmission After Classification

The ability to perform the process of image data and classification at each monitoring module allows the transmission of only pertinent data from each separate monitoring module to a monitoring station. In embodiments of the present invention, if an extracted object is classified as a human alarm object, then only that data representing the extracted object is transmitted in a stylized way to the monitoring station. This is what is displayed to the operator at the monitoring station. Representing the image in a stylized manner creates data easily interpreted by an operator at the monitoring station. This type of data also protects the integrity of individuals which are not deemed to be a security concern, since the actual image is not transmitted.

Yuasa teaches a completely different system and design. In Yuasa, predefined pattern data of objects such as humans, smoke, etc., are compared to images obtained by the cameras. The predefined pattern data is a line drawing. The pattern data is not a stylized representation of the extracted image data. In fact, it can't be since it is predefined prior to capturing the image data. It is only a symbol of the object in the image, human, smoke, etc. and nothing more.

From the comparison of the location of where the object was in the image, an alarm data is generated. The alarm data, picture data and line drawing data (pattern data) are all transmitted and displayed for an operator. See Col. 11, lines 47-50, 58-62 and Col. 12, lines 14-16.

Thus, Yuasa teaches transmitting various data including alarm data, picture data and a line drawing data (which is a symbol) to an operator. Nowhere does Yuasa teach transmitting only the extracted object of an image, let alone in a stylized way when the object is classified as a human alarm

object. In fact, the only image data transmitted in Yuasa is the extracted picture data. The line drawing data is not image data but a predefined symbol or representation of objects which are believed to have appeared in the image data. A line drawing data, however, is not taken from the image data itself.

Thus, Yuasa fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, transmitting, only if the object is classified human alarm object, data representing only the extracted area of the image in a stylized way, the stylized way representing a recognizable human shape, to the monitoring station, as recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 9.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuasa fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 6 and 9 as required. Further, dependent claims 2-5, 7-8 and 10-11 are also distinguishable over the cited art for the reasons above as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit

Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,491  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant